In RE 10/684,165 Response to July 1, 2004 Official Action Page -4-

## REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hermann, Mallott, and Van Dyk, Jr.

Claim 2 has been canceled.

Claims 7-15 have been allowed. The Applicant appreciates this allowance. Claim 12 has been amended to correct a typographical mistake.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the extending means is activated by the closing of the door. This limitation was recited in dependent claim 2 which is presently canceled. Additional support for this amendment can be found on page 10, line 25 through page 11, line 6 of the specification.

Applicant submits that none of the prior art on record discloses an automatic activation mechanism for the extending means as now recited in amended claim 1. For instance, Hermann discloses an electrical activation mechanism to cause the door leaf to move downward when the door is closed (Column 5, lines 15-19). Subsequently, the air bladder is inflated by conventional pressurizing means (lines 30-34). There is no suggestion that this electrical activation mechanism automatically initiates the inflation.

Claim 16 (depending on allowed claim 7) has been added to incorporate the same activation mechanism as in presently amended Claim 1.

No new matter has been added.

An earnest attempt has been made hereby to fully respond to the §102 rejections contained in the July 1, 2004, Official Action for the above-identified matter. All claims are deemed in proper form and scope for allowance. If the Examiner feels that a telephonic interview will expedite allowance of the instant application, he is respectfully urged to call the undersigned. Final allowance of claims 7-15, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-6, and consideration and allowance of newly added claim 16 is hereby solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

CHERSKOV AND FLAXNIK

Michael J. Cherskov (Reg. No. 33,664)